IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Pratt et al.** §	
§	Group Art Unit: **2152**
Serial No. **09/726,266** §	
§	Examiner: **Philip C. Lee**
Filed: **November 30, 2000** §	
§	
For: **Method for Managing Resources** §	
on a Per User Basis for Unix Based §	
Systems	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

35525
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

APPEAL BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.37)

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on June 29, 2006.

No fees are believed to be required. If, however, any fees are required, I authorize the
Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No.
09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is
required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this
extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is the following party: International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, New York.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

With respect to other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no such appeals or interferences.

<div align="center">

STATUS OF CLAIMS

</div>

A.   TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

The claims in the application are: 1-3, 5-12, 15, and 18-28.

B.   STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1.   Claims canceled: None.

2.   Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None.

3.   Claims pending: 1-3, 5-12, 15, and 18-28.

4.   Claims allowed: None.

5.   Claims rejected: 1-3, 5-12, 15, and 18-28.

6.   Claims objected to: None.

C.   CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-3, 5-12, 15, and 18-28.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were submitted after the final office action of April 3, 2006.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A.   CLAIM 1 - INDEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 1 is directed to a method for managing resources on a computer network. A configuration file is created for each user on the network. When a user logs onto a local client computer, the user identity is matched to the configuration file. Based on the configuration file, the user is allowed access to particular resources on the local client computer. In the UNIX Operating System, all resources must be attached at the local computer. What the method of claimed invention does is set up a configuration file for each user. The configuration file allows a user to attach quickly resources to which he is supposed to have access. Thus, the method of claim 1 allows users to access an individualized configuration of network resources from any client within the network, rather than limiting the configuration to one particular client. Support for claim 1 may be found in the Specification on page 9, line 22 through page 10, line 30 and in Figure 4.

B.   CLAIM 18 – INDEPENDENT

Claim 18 is directed to a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method claimed in claim 1. Support for claim 18 may be found in the Specification on page 9, line 22 through page 10, line 30 and in Figure 4.

C.   CLAIM 27 - INDEPENDENT

Claim 27 is directed to a system for managing resources on a computer network where the system is designed to carry out the method of claim 1. Support for claim 27 may be found on in the Specification on page 9, line 22 through page 10, line 30 and in Figure 4.

The means for defining the contents for a configuration file may be found on page 10, lines 9 through 12. The support for a means for receiving a login identification for user may be found in network 102 shown in Figure 1 and described on page 5, line 4 through page 6, line 21. The means for matching the user identity with the user configuration file may be found in Figure 2 and specifically processors 202 and 204 in Figure 2, which are described on page 6, line 25 through page 7, line 5. The means for attaching network resources to a client computer based on the user

identity and contents of the user configuration file may be found in Figure 1, specifically network 102, which is described on page 5, line 5 through page 6, line 21. Support for the term "wherein said computer network is configured to run on an operating system that includes an attachment of resources to a given computer to be formed on said given computer" may be found on page 1, lines 24 through 30.

D.   CLAIM 28 – DEPENDENT

Support for "means for receiving a log out command from the user" may be found in network 102 shown in Figure 1 and described on page 5, line 4 through page 6, line 21. The means for matching the user identity with the user configuration file may be found in Figure 2 and specifically processors 202 and 204 in Figure 2, which are described on page 6, line 25 through page 7, line 5.

Support for "means for unattaching the attached resources to a client computer based on the user identity and contents of the user configuration file" may be found in Figure 1, specifically network 102, which is described on page 5, line 5 through page 6, line 21. Support for the term "wherein said computer network is configured to run on an operating system that includes an attachment of resources to a given computer to be formed on said given computer" may be found on page 1, lines 24 through 30.

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A.   GROUND OF REJECTION 1 (Claim 18)

Whether claim 18 is directed towards statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

B.   GROUND OF REJECTION 2 (Claims 1, 3, 5, 18, 19, and 27)

Whether claims 1, 3, 5, 18-19, and 27 fail to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by *Marks* et al., An Entity Model That Enables Privilege Tracking Across Multiple Terminals, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0010768 (January 24, 2002) (hereinafter "*Marks*").

C.   GROUND OF REJECTION 3 (Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 15, 20, 22, and 23)

Whether claims 2, 6, 8-9, 15, 20, and 22-23 are non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Marks* and *Win et al.*, Administrative Roles that Govern Access to Administrative Functions, U.S. Patent 6,161,139 (December 12, 2000) (hereinafter "*Win*").

D.   GROUND OF REJECTION 4 (Claims 7, 10, 11, 21, 24, 25, and 28)

Whether claims 7, 10, 11, 21, 24, 25, and 28 are non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Marks*, *Win*, and *Corn et al.*, Procedure for Safely Terminating Network Programs During Network Logoff, U.S. Patent 5,781,738 (July 14, 1998) (hereinafter "*Corn*").

E.   GROUND OF REJECTION 5 (Claims 12 and 26)

Whether claims 12 and 26 are non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Win* and *Birrell et al.*, Secure Web Tunnel, U.S. Patent 5,805,803 (September 8, 1998) (hereinafter "*Birrell*").

ARGUMENT

A. GROUND OF REJECTION 1 (Claim 18)

The Examiner rejects claim 18 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. The Examiner states that:

> Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 18 claimed a computer program product stored in a computer-readable medium, and the specification defined the computer-readable medium as a transmission type media (signal or transmittal wave) (spec, page 11, lines 14-32). Thus, a computer program product stored on a transmission type media is not of the categories of statutory subject matter.

Final Office Action of April 3, 2006, p. 2.

The Examiner asserts that claim 18 is not limited to tangible embodiments. No basis is present for holding a computer usable medium claim non-statutory because the medium may be allegedly "intangible." The MPEP states:

> In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.
>
> When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). (emphasis added)

MPEP 2106 (IV)(B)(1)

Claim 18 recites clearly functional descriptive material since it imparts functionality when employed as a computer component. Moreover, the functional descriptive material of claim 18 is recorded on "some" computer-readable medium.

In the above context, the term "some" means "any" computer-readable medium. The MPEP does not draw any distinctions between one type of media that is considered to be statutory and another type of media that is considered to be non-statutory. To the contrary, the MPEP clearly states that as long as the functional descriptive material is in "some" computer-readable medium, it should be considered statutory. The only exceptions to this statement in the MPEP are functional descriptive material that does not generate a useful, concrete and tangible result, e.g., functional descriptive material composed completely of pure mathematical concepts that provide no practical result. Claim 18 clearly recites a useful, concrete and tangible result in that items similar to a target item, identified by a cursor's position, are identified and an indicator of these similar items is provided so that these similar items may be accessed. This feature is not a disembodied mathematical concept or abstract idea.

Thus, claim 18 is directed to functional descriptive material that provides a useful, concrete and tangible result, and which is embodied on "some" computer-readable medium. Therefore, claim 18 is statutory and the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 has been overcome.

Additionally, the rejection is incorrect in view of new guidelines covering patentability of claims directed to a process in a computer readable medium. The USPTO guidelines for evaluating computer-readable medium encoded with functional descriptive material, such as a computer program, expressly states that a claim to such computer-readable medium when so encoded is statutory subject matter. USPTO, *Interim Guideline for Examination of Patent Application for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility* (26 Oct. 2005) (hereinafter "The Guideline"). The Guideline provides, in relevant part:

> "[A] claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory."

Id., p. 52. The Guideline further provides:

> Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural

phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 112-14. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in §101.

...

These interim guidelines propose that such signal claims are ineligible for patent protection because they do not fall within any of the four statutory classes of §101. Public comment is sought for further evaluation of this question.

Id., pp. 55-56. Claim 18 is as follows:

18. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in a data processing system for managing resources in a computer network, the computer program product comprising:

instructions for creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network, wherein each configuration file contains a list of the network resources that a user may access;

instructions for receiving a user identification at a client;

instructions for initiating a resource attachment program in response to receiving the user identification;

instructions for matching, using the resource attachment program, the user identification with a configuration file associated with the user identification; and

and instructions for attaching, using the resource attachment program, network resources to the client based on the list contained in the configuration file associated with the user identification.

Claim 18 is directed to a computer program product in a computer readable medium. Furthermore, the computer program product is for use in a data processing system. As the Guideline provides, "a computer readable medium with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized" is statutory. Because claim 18 recites a computer program product for use in a data processing system, along with the other recited steps, claim 18 does describe a data structure that defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. Thus, claim 18 is patentable subject mater under 35 U.S.C. §101, as explained under the Guideline.

In addition, the instant claim does not recite a signal. Rather, the claim recites a "computer readable medium" in which a signal is embedded. Claim 18 claims functional descriptive material

encoded on a computer readable medium and does not claim signals encoded with functional descriptive material. For this reason, claim 18 thus falls under allowable statutory matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. This assertion is fully supported by the specification that provides:

> Examples of computer readable media include recordable-type media, such as a floppy disk, a hard disk drive, a RAM, CD-ROMs, DVD-ROMs, and *transmission-type media*, such as digital and analog communications links, wired or wireless communications links *using transmission forms*, such as, for example, radio frequency and light wave transmissions. The computer readable media may take the form of coded formats that are decoded for actual use in a particular data processing system.

Specification, p. 11, l. 27 through p. 12 l. 4 (emphasis supplied).

The specification and claim 18 are statutory subject matter because the claim is directed towards the *medium*, and not to the radio frequency or the light wave signals that may inherently be *used* in such media technologies. The use of radio frequency or light waves as a method of encoding or recording the computer program on to such medium does not render the medium itself nonstatutory. Even in case of a CD-ROM, a laser form of light wave is used for accomplishing the encoding/recording of the information on to the CD-ROM, yet the CD-ROM remains a well-accepted computer readable medium. Encoding the air or glass fiber medium with radio frequency or light waves similarly cannot render the air or glass fiber medium nonstatutory under §101.

Thus, based on the MPEP and applicable case law, claim 18 is statutory under 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask the board to reverse the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and direct the Examiner to allow the claim.

B.   GROUND OF REJECTION 2 (Claims 1, 3, 5, 18, 19, and 27)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 5, 18, 19, and 27 as anticipated by *Marks*. The Examiner states that:

> As per claims 1, 18 and 27, Marks taught the invention as claimed comprising:
>
> Creating a particular configuration file (user profile) for each user of a network, wherein each configuration file contains a list of the network resources that a user may access (page 4, paragraph 47);
>
> receiving a user identification at a client (page 4, paragraph 45);

initiating a resource attachment program in response to receiving the user identification (page 4, paragraphs 46 and 47) (i.e., the middleware server queries the user database to determine a user profile for the user in response to receiving the user identification);

matching, using the resource attachment program, the user identification with a configuration file associated with the user identification (page 4, paragraph 47); and

attaching, using the resource attachment program, network resources to the client based on the list contained in the configuration file associated with the user identification (page 5, paragraph 51).

Final Office Action of April 3, 2006, pp. 3-4.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. §102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case, *Marks* does not show every element of the invention of claim 1, arranged as they are in the claims.

Claim 1 is a representative claim of this grouping of claims. Claim 1 is as follows:

1. A method for managing resources in a computer network, comprising:
creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network, wherein each configuration file contains a list of the network resources that a user may access;
receiving a user identification at a client;
initiating a resource attachment program in response to receiving the user identification;
matching, using the resource attachment program, the user identification with a configuration file associated with the user identification; and
attaching, using the resource attachment program, network resources to the client based on the list contained in the configuration file associated with the user identification.

Marks does not anticipate claim 1 because *Marks* does not teach the claimed feature of "creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network," as claimed. Additionally, *Marks* does not teach the claimed features of matching *and* attaching using the same resource attachment program, as recited in claim 1.

Regarding the claimed feature of, "creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network," the Examiner asserts that *Marks* does teach this claimed feature, citing *Marks* as follows:

> [0047] User privileges are determined at 520. In one embodiment, a middleware server in a network operations center *queries the user database in the network operations center to determine a user profile for the user.* The user profile includes the class of user and a set of user privileges and settings (e.g., application licenses, bookmarks, file access privileges, network access privileges, limited access to specific Web pages defined by specific URL allow and deny lists) for the user. The middleware server and/or the user database can be replicated to a local network.

Marks, paragraph 0047 (emphasis supplied).

This portion of *Marks* teaches a method of determining user privileges. In this example, *Marks* states that a server queries a user database to determine a user profile for the user. The user profile contains information regarding the user, including privileges and settings.

However, on its face *Marks* fails to teach the feature of claim 1 of "creating a particular configuration file for *each user of a network*." Instead, *Marks* teaches that user information is stored in a user database. If and when a user attempts to login, then a user profile is generated for the user. However, a particular configuration file is not created for *each user of a network*, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner might argue that if every user of a network were to log on to *Marks*' system, then a configuration file would be created for each user of the network. The Examiner might also argue that the term "each user of a network" means "all users currently logged on to the network." However, *Marks* does not actually require either feature or conclusion. Thus, neither argument is appropriate in an anticipation rejection, which requires that each and every feature be *identically* shown in the reference.

Moreover, both arguments fail when claim 1 is considered as a whole. Claim 1 includes creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network, then receiving a user identification, initiating a resource attachment program, matching the user identification with the particular configuration file for that user, and attaching the appropriate resources. Based on the overall presentation of claim 1, interpreting claim 1 to mean "logging onto a network, and then creating a configuration file for that single user," as taught by *Marks*, makes no sense. For this reason, *Marks* does not teach all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, *Marks* does not anticipate claim 1.

In addition, *Marks* does not teach all of the features of claim 1, arranged as they are in the claims. Specifically, *Marks* does not teach the claimed feature of, "matching, using the resource attachment program, the user identification with a configuration file associated with the user identification," in conjunction with the claimed feature of, "attaching, using the resource attachment program, network resources to the client based on the list contained in the configuration file associated with the user identification."

In order for *Marks* to teach the matching step in conjunction with the attaching step, *Marks* would have to use the same program to perform the claimed matching and attaching steps. This fact stems from the features in claim 1 that the same resource attachment program performs both the matching and the attaching steps as claimed.

However, *Marks* uses *different* programs for attaching and matching. Specifically, *Marks* uses a "middleware server" to perform the matching step. For example, *Marks* states that:

> [0047] User privileges are determined at 520. In one embodiment, a middleware server in a network operations center queries the user database in the network operations center to determine a user profile for the user. The user profile includes the class of user and a set of user privileges and settings (e.g., application licenses, bookmarks, file access privileges, network access privileges, limited access to specific Web pages defined by specific URL allow and deny lists) for the user. The middleware server and/or the user database can be replicated to a local network.

> [0048] Device privileges are determined at 530. In one embodiment, the middleware server in the network operations center queries an asset database in the network operations center to determine a terminal profile for the terminal. The terminal profile includes a set of device privileges (e.g., applications available, network connections). Alternatively, the middleware server and/or the asset database can be replicated to a server on a common local area network with the terminal.

Marks, paragraphs 0047 and 0048.

Marks specifically provides that user privileges and device privileges are determined using the middleware server in conjunction with user databases and asset databases, respectively. *Marks* also specifically provides that the attachment of resources to a terminal is performed by a client application running on the terminal itself. In particular, *Marks* states that:

> [0051] The terminal is configured at 540. In one embodiment, the terminal configuration includes granting access to resources based on the session privileges. In one embodiment, terminal configuration is accomplished via a

client application running on the terminal that is configured based on the session privileges. For example, the client application can dynamically load, either from local storage or from the network operations center, a list of parameters including, but not limited to: active allow/deny Uniform Resource Locator (URL) list(s); a list of bookmarks to various resources; an appropriate user interface configuration file; and available local applications and resources.

[0052] The appropriate resources are provided at 550. In one embodiment resources are provided via a user interface described in greater detail below. The user interface is configured based, at least in part, on the session privileges.

Thus, *Marks* teaches the use of a middleware server to determine matching a user identification to a user profile, but uses a client application running on the terminal in question to actually configure that terminal. Assuming, *arguendo*, that these features are equivalent to the claimed features of matching and attaching, as the Examiner asserts, then *Marks* requires that the matching and attaching steps as claimed be performed using *different applications or objects*. In contrast, claim 1 requires that "the" resource attachment program be used to perform both functions. For this reason, *Marks* does not teach all of the features of claim 1. Thus, again, *Marks* does not anticipate claim 1.

C.   GROUND OF REJECTION 3 (Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 15, 20, 22, and 23)

Whether claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 15, 20, 22, and 23 are non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Marks* and *Win et al.*, Administrative Roles that Govern Access to Administrative Functions, U.S. Patent 6,161,139 (December 12, 2000) (hereinafter "*Win*").

C.1.   Claims 2 and 15

C.1.i. The Proposed Combination Does Not Teach All of the Features of the Claims

Regarding claims 2 and 15, the Examiner states that:

Win was cited in the last office action.

As per claims 2 and 15, Marks taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Marks did not specifically teach the list is defined by a network administrator. Win taught wherein the list is defined by a network administrator (col. 12, lines 45-50).

> It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Win because Win's teaching of a network administrator defining the list would increase the administrator's flexibility in Marks's system by allowing administrator to control the assignment of resources to users (col. 12, lines 45-48).

Final Office Action of April 3, 2006, p.5.

If the Patent Office does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the applicant is entitled to grant of a patent. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985). A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 2 is a representative claim of claims 2 and 15. Claim 2 is as follows:

> 2. The method according to claim 1, wherein the list is defined by a network administrator.

The Examiner failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because the proposed combination of *Marks* and *Win* does not teach all of the features of claim 1, from which claim 2 depends. As shown above, *Marks* does not teach the claimed feature of, "creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network," as claimed. Additionally, *Marks* does not teach the claimed features of matching *and* attaching using the same resource attachment program, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, *Marks* does not suggest these claimed features for the reasons provided above.

Additionally, the Examiner does not assert that *Win* teaches or suggests these claimed features. In fact, *Win* does not teach or suggest these claimed features. In a previous response to office action, Applicants proved this fact as follows:

> As can be seen, none of the cited passages actually discloses creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network, wherein each configuration file contains a list of the network resources that a user may access, as claimed. The examiner asserts in a response to argument that creation of user profiles by assigning roles to users is the same as defining

the content of a configuration file of each network user (citing the older claim language.) However, the two features are entirely distinct and the examiner provides no foundation for the assertion that they are equivalent. *Win*'s statement that, "system 2 enables the creation of... user profiles by assigning roles to users to generate access rights," col. 5, ll. 26-29, is not equivalent to , "a particular configuration file is created for each user of a network," as claimed.

Moreover, a separate file need not be created for each user profile. For example, a plurality of user profiles may be stored in a single file. In fact, *Win* stores user profiles in a single file and does not show or suggest storing each user profile in a particular configuration file for each user, as claimed. The very text cited by the examiner directly supports this fact and directly contradicts the examiner's assertions to the contrary. For example, *Win* states that, "Registry Server 108 stores information defining the user in the Registry Repository 110." *Win*, col. 15, ll. 33-34.

Response to Office Action of August 3, 2005, p. 11 (emphasis in original).

Therefore, neither *Marks* nor *Win* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Claim 2 includes these features at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Therefore, neither *Marks* nor *Win* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 2. For this reason, the proposed combination of *Marks* and *Win* when considered as a whole does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 2. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 2 or the other claim in this grouping of claims.

C.1.ii. The Examiner has Failed to Provide a Proper Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation to Combine the References

In addition, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 2 because the Examiner did not provide a proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references to achieve the invention of claim 2. A proper *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art absent some teaching, incentive, or suggestion supporting the combination. *In re Napier*, 55 F.3d 610, 613, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1782, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 834, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Regarding a possible teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the Examiner states that:

> It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Win because Win's teaching of a network administrator defining the list would increase the administrator's flexibility in Marks's system by allowing administrator to control the assignment of resources to users (col. 12, lines 45-48).

Final Office Action of April 3, 2006, p.5.

Thus, the Examiner asserts that combining the references would be obvious because of the advantage of increasing flexibility in *Marks*' system. However, an advantage is not necessarily a teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references. In order to serve as a teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references one of ordinary skill would have to both recognize the advantage and have a reason to implement it. In the case at hand, one of ordinary skill might recognize the advantage, as the advantage is recited in *Win* itself. However, one of ordinary skill would have a reason to *avoid* implementing the advantage.

For example, the entire point of *Marks*' system is to create a user profile for a user at the moment that the user logs in. The user profile is created from a database describing the resources that a particular user is allowed to access. Thus, *Marks*' system is designed to quickly and automatically create user profiles upon user login. In contrast, the proposed combination would require that the system administrator in *Marks* manually define the user profile itself. Adjusting the user profile itself would be labor intensive, inefficient, time consuming, and undesirable. Instead, the network administrator would take the more efficient action of maintaining the database to adjust how a user profile is generated on user login. Thus, one of ordinary skill would be motivated to *avoid* combining the references to achieve the features of claim 2.

For this reason, no proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references exists and the Examiner's proposed motivation is insufficient to serve as a proper teaching suggestion, or motivation to combine the references. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 2 or of claim 15.

C.1.iii. No Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation Exists to Combine the References Because Each Reference Represents a Complete Solution to the Problem That Each Solves

The Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 2 because no proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references. No proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references because both *Marks* and *Win* represent complete solutions to the problems each solves.

Marks is directed to the problem of quickly and consistently providing network access privileges for a user. For example, *Marks* provides that:

> [0003] Typically, when a user logs in to a network using a particular terminal, network privileges are provided based on the identity of the user. One shortcoming of these networks is that local access privileges are determined based on a user identification only. Another shortcoming is that when the user moves to a different terminal within the network or to a terminal on a different network, the user may not be able to login, or the user's access privilege may change and/or the interface provided to the user may be significantly different than what the user is used to using. For example, resources available on a first terminal may not be available on a second terminal. This may confuse or frustrate users and/or network administrators.

> [0004] What is needed is a network management scheme that provides users with a consistent set of access privileges and a consistent user experience based on, for example, both user identity and terminal identification. Such a network management scheme can be especially useful in an environment, such as a school, where access privileges are carefully controlled, and users do not have dedicated (e.g., personal) workstations.

Marks, paragraphs 0003 and 0004.

Marks solves this problem by establishing a central database that correlates user identities with user privileges at a particular workstation. *Marks* has no need for a network administrator to define a configuration file because *Marks* establishes a user profile upon user login. Thus, the system administrator in *Marks* need only update the central database, and not each individual file. Certainly, *Marks* already purports to solve the problem of user privileges in a large network, so *Marks* has no reason to further modify his teaching to address the problem solved by claim 2. Thus, *Marks* is a complete solution to the problem addressed by *Marks*.

On the other hand, *Win* is directed to the problem of allowing multiple administrators to have different levels of access control to different resource types. For example, *Win* states that:

> There is a need to selectively delegate to multiple administrators the administration of access control to resources connected to various networks, allowing some of the administrators to administer one set of resources while disallowing others. There is need to selectively grant administrative privileges to the multiple administrators. There is yet another need to selectively delegate administration and grant administrative privileges to the multiple administrators using a mechanism that is simple to use.

Win, col. 2, ll. 35-43.

    Win solves this problem by storing user profiles in a single file. For example, *Win* states that, "Registry Server 108 stores information defining the user in the Registry Repository 110." *Win*, col. 15, ll. 33-34. *Win* has no need to modify his method, because *Win* provides a complete solution to the problem that *Win* addresses.

    Because each reference provides a complete solution to the problem that each reference represents, one of ordinary skill would have no reason to combine or otherwise modify the references. For this reason, no teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references to achieve the invention of claim 2. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 2.

C.2.   Claims 6, 8, 9, 20, 22, and 23

C.2.i. The Proposed Combination Does Not Teach All of the Features of the Claims

    Regarding claims 6, 8, 9, 20, 22, and 23, the Examiner states that:

> As per claims 6 and 20, Marks taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Mark did not specifically teach said resource attachment program is stored on a server. Win taught wherein the resource attachment program is stored on a network server (fig. 7; col. 12, lines 51-53).

> It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Win for the same reasons set forth in claim 2 above.

> As per claims 8 and 22, Mark and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win further taught wherein the record is stored on the client (col. 13, lines 20-21; col. 23, lines 47-51).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Win for the same reason set forth in claim 7 above.

As per claims 9 and 23, Marks and Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win further taught wherein the record is stored on a network server (col. 13, lines 21-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Win for the same reason set forth in claim 7 above.

Final Office Action of April 3, 2006, pp. 5-6.

Claim 6 is a representative claim of this grouping of claims. Claim 6 is as follows:

6. The method according to claim 1, wherein said resource attachment program is stored on a network server.

The Examiner failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because the proposed combination of *Marks* and *Win* does not teach all of the features of claim 1, from which claim 6 depends. As shown above, *Marks* does not teach the claimed feature of, "creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network," as claimed. Additionally, *Marks* does not teach the claimed features of matching *and* attaching using the same resource attachment program, as recited in claim 6. Furthermore, *Marks* does not suggest these claimed features for the reasons provided above.

Additionally, the Examiner does not assert that *Win* teaches or suggests these claimed features. In fact, *Win* does not teach or suggest these claimed features, as shown above. Therefore, neither *Marks* nor *Win* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Claim 6 includes these features at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Therefore, neither *Marks* nor *Win* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 6. For this reason, the proposed combination of *Marks* and *Win* when considered as a whole does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 6. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 6 or the other claim in this grouping of claims.

**C.2.ii. No Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation Exists to Combine the References Because
Each Reference Represents a Complete Solution to the Problem That Each Solves**

The Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 6
because no proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references. No proper
teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references because both *Marks* and *Win*
represent complete solutions to the problems each solves.

Marks is directed to the problem of quickly and consistently providing network access
privileges for a user. For example, *Marks* provides that:

> [0003] Typically, when a user logs in to a network using a particular
> terminal, network privileges are provided based on the identity of the user.
> One shortcoming of these networks is that local access privileges are
> determined based on a user identification only. Another shortcoming is that
> when the user moves to a different terminal within the network or to a
> terminal on a different network, the user may not be able to login, or the
> user's access privilege may change and/or the interface provided to the user
> may be significantly different than what the user is used to using. For
> example, resources available on a first terminal may not be available on a
> second terminal. This may confuse or frustrate users and/or network
> administrators.
>
> [0004] What is needed is a network management scheme that provides users
> with a consistent set of access privileges and a consistent user experience
> based on, for example, both user identity and terminal identification. Such a
> network management scheme can be especially useful in an environment,
> such as a school, where access privileges are carefully controlled, and users
> do not have dedicated (e.g., personal) workstations.

Marks, paragraphs 0003 and 0004.

Marks solves this problem by establishing a central database that correlates user identities
with user privileges at a particular workstation. *Marks* has no need for a network administrator to
define a configuration file because *Marks* establishes a user profile upon user login. Thus, the
system administrator in *Marks* need only update the central database, and not each individual file.
Certainly, *Marks* already purports to solve the problem of user privileges in a large network, so
Marks has no reason to further modify his teaching to address the problem solved by claim 2.
Thus, *Marks* is a complete solution to the problem addressed by *Marks*.

On the other hand, *Win* is directed to the problem of allowing multiple administrators to
have different levels of access control to different resource types. For example, *Win* states that:

There is a need to selectively delegate to multiple administrators the administration of access control to resources connected to various networks, allowing some of the administrators to administer one set of resources while disallowing others. There is need to selectively grant administrative privileges to the multiple administrators. There is yet another need to selectively delegate administration and grant administrative privileges to the multiple administrators using a mechanism that is simple to use.

Win, col. 2, ll. 35-43.

　　Win solves this problem by storing user profiles in a single file. For example, *Win* states that, "Registry Server 108 stores information defining the user in the Registry Repository 110." *Win*, col. 15, ll. 33-34. *Win* has no need to modify his method, because *Win* provides a complete solution to the problem that *Win* addresses.

　　Because each reference provides a complete solution to the problem that each reference represents, one of ordinary skill would have no reason to combine or otherwise modify the references. For this reason, no teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references to achieve the invention of claim 6. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 6.

D.　　GROUND OF REJECTION 4 (Claims 7, 10, 11, 21, 24, 25, and 28)

　　Whether claims 7, 10, 11, 21, 24, 25, and 28 are non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Marks*, *Win*, and *Corn et al.*, Procedure for Safely Terminating Network Programs During Network Logoff, U.S. Patent 5,781,738 (July 14, 1998) (hereinafter "*Corn*").

D.1.　　Claims 7, 11, 21, and 25

　　Regarding claims 7, 11, 21, and 25, the Examiner states that:

　　　　Corn was cited in the last office action.

　　　　As per claims 7 and 21, Marks taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Mark did not teach creating a record of all successfully attached resources. Corn taught creating a record of all successfully attached resources (col. 3, line 46-col. 4, line 6).

　　　　It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Corn because Corn's teaching of creating a record of all successfully attached

resources would increase the alertness of Marks's system by allowing the system to determine whether any programs or files (i.e. resources) are opened across the network (col. 4, lines 5-13).

...

As per claims 11 and 25, Marks and Corn taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Corn further taught comprising:

Receiving a log out command from the user and deleting the record of attached resources (col. 7, lines 33-39; col. 5, line 64-col. 6, lines 4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Corn for the same reason set forth in claim 7 above.

Final Office Action of April 3, 2006, pp. 7-8.

D.1.i. The Proposed Combination Does Not Teach All of the Features of the Claims

Claim 7 is a representative claim of this grouping of claims. Claim 7 is as follows:

7. The method according to claim 1 further comprising: creating a record of all successfully attached resources.

The Examiner failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because the proposed combination of *Marks* and *Corn* does not teach all of the features of claim 1, from which claim 7 depends. As shown above, *Marks* does not teach the claimed feature of, "creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network," as claimed. Additionally, *Marks* does not teach the claimed features of matching *and* attaching using the same resource attachment program, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, *Marks* does not suggest these claimed features for the reasons provided above.

Additionally, the Examiner does not assert that *Corn* teaches or suggests these claimed features. In fact, *Corn* does not teach or suggest these claimed features. *Corn* is instead directed to terminating a client server network connection safely (*Corn*, Abstract), which is unrelated to the claim features at issue. Therefore, *Corn* fails to cure the lack of disclosure in *Marks* regarding the features of claim 1.

Accordingly, neither *Marks* nor *Corn* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Claim 7 includes these features at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Therefore, neither *Marks* nor *Corn* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7. For this reason, the proposed combination

of *Marks* and *Corn* when considered as a whole does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 7 or the other claims in this grouping of claims.

D.1.ii. No Motivation Exists to Combine *Marks* and *Corn* Because They Address Different Problems

One of ordinary skill would not combine the references to achieve the invention of claim 7 because the references are directed towards solving different problems. It is necessary to consider the reality of the circumstances--in other words, common sense--in deciding in which fields a person of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Wood*, 599 F.2d 1032, 1036, 202 U.S.P.Q. 171, 174 (CCPA 1979). In the case at hand, the cited references address distinct problems. Thus, no common sense reason exists to establish that one of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor. Accordingly, no teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references and the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 7.

For example, *Marks* is directed to solving the problem of quickly and consistently providing network access privileges for a user, as established above. On the other hand, *Corn* is directed to the problem of terminating a client server network connection, as shown by the following text:

> The user of a client workstation who has completed use of the server resources may disconnect or logoff from the network. Existing network operating systems provide no facility for ensuring that all client computer system programs executed from the server have been properly terminated by the user. While some network operating systems check for files remaining open across the network, none check for loaded executable programs using programs or libraries across the network. Once the network connection has been severed, the programs in the memory of the client system are no longer operable. However, these programs still reside in the memory of the client computer system taking up a valuable resource. These inoperable programs also have the potential to cause operational failures to the computer system. User selection of a computer program executing from the server after disconnecting from that server may cause the client system to crash or become unusable.

> Thus, there exists a technical problem of being able to determine at logoff whether or not server files are being used by the client computer system.

Corn, col. 1, ll. 38-58.

Based on the plain disclosures of the references themselves, the references address completely distinct problems that are unrelated to each other. The problem of quickly and consistently providing network access privileges for a user is completely distinct from the problem of terminating a client server network connection.

Because the references address completely distinct problems, one of ordinary skill would have no reason to combine or otherwise modify the references to achieve the invention of claim 7. Thus, no proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 7 or any other claim in this grouping of claims.

D.2.   Claims 10, 24, and 28

Regarding claims 10, 24, and 28, the Examiner states that:

> As per claims 10, 24, and 28, Marks taught the invention as claimed in claims 1, 18, and 27 above. Marks did not teach unattaching the resources when the user logs out. Corn taught comprising:
>
> Receiving a log out command from the user and unattaching the attached resources (col. 3, lines 28-45).
>
> It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Corn because Corn's teaching of unattaching the resources would increase the efficiency of Marks's system by allowing the unattached resources to be shared with other user (col. 3, lines 32-33).

Final Office Action of April 3, 2006, pp. 7-8.

D.2.i.   The Proposed Combination Does Not Teach All of the Features of the Claims

Claim 10 is a representative claim of this grouping of claims. Claim 10 is as follows:

> 10. The method according to claim 1, further comprising:
>   receiving a log out command; and
>   thereafter unattaching the attached resources.

The Examiner failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because the proposed combination of *Marks* and *Corn* does not teach all of the features of claim 1, from which claim 10 depends. As shown above, *Marks* does not teach the claimed feature of, "creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network," as claimed. Additionally, *Marks* does not teach the claimed features of matching *and* attaching using the same resource attachment program, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, *Marks* does not suggest these claimed features for the reasons provided above.

Additionally, the Examiner does not assert that *Corn* teaches or suggests these claimed features. In fact, *Corn* does not teach or suggest these claimed features. *Corn* is instead directed to terminating a client server network connection safely (*Corn*, Abstract), which is unrelated to the claim features at issue. Therefore, *Corn* fails to cure the lack of disclosure in *Marks* regarding the features of claim 1.

Therefore, neither *Marks* nor *Corn* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Claim 10 includes these features at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Therefore, neither *Marks* nor *Corn* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 10. For this reason, the proposed combination of *Marks* and *Corn* when considered as a whole does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 10. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 10 or the other claims in this grouping of claims.

D.2.ii. No Motivation Exists to Combine *Marks* and *Corn* Because They Address Different Problems

One of ordinary skill would not combine the references to achieve the invention of claim 7 because the references are directed towards solving different problems. It is necessary to consider the reality of the circumstances--in other words, common sense--in deciding in which fields a person of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Wood*, 599 F.2d 1032, 1036, 202 U.S.P.Q. 171, 174 (CCPA 1979). In the case at hand, the cited references address distinct problems. Thus, no common sense reason exists to establish that one of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor. Accordingly, no

teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references and the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 10.

For example, *Marks* is directed to solving the problem of quickly and consistently providing network access privileges for a user, as established above. On the other hand, *Corn* is directed to the problem of terminating a client server network connection. Based on the plain disclosures of the references themselves, the references address completely distinct problems that are unrelated to each other. The problem of quickly and consistently providing network access privileges for a user is completely distinct from the problem of terminating a client server network connection.

Because the references address completely distinct problems, one of ordinary skill would have no reason to combine or otherwise modify the references to achieve the invention of claim 10. Thus, no proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 10 or any other claim in this grouping of claims.

E.   GROUND OF REJECTION 5 (Claims 12 and 26)

Whether claims 12 and 26 are non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Win* and *Birrell et al.*, Secure Web Tunnel, U.S. Patent 5,805,803 (September 8, 1998) (hereinafter "*Birrell*"). The Examiner states that:

> Birrell was cited in the last office action.
>
> As per claims 12 and 26, Marks taught the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Marks did not teach the client computer uses the UNIX operating system. Birrell taught wherein the client computer uses the UNIX operating system (col. 15, lines 23-32).
>
> It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marks and Birrell because Birrell's teaching of using the UNIX operating system would increase the flexibility of Marks's system by allowing the use of client with different type of operating system according to the choice of the designer.

Final Office Action of April 3, 2006, pp. 8-9.

E.1.   The Proposed Combination Does Not Teach All of the Features of the Claims

Claim 12 is a representative claim of this grouping of claims. Claim 12 is as follows:

> 12. The method according to claim 1, wherein the client uses the UNIX operating system.

The Examiner failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because the proposed combination of *Win* and *Birrell* does not teach all of the features of claim 1, from which claim 12 depends. As shown above and in the previous response to office action, *Win* does not teach the claimed feature of, "creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network," as claimed. Additionally, *Win* does not teach the claimed features of matching *and* attaching using the same resource attachment program, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, *Win* does not suggest these claimed features for the reasons provided above.

Additionally, the Examiner does not assert that *Birrell* teaches or suggests these claimed features. In fact, *Birrell* does not teach or suggest these claimed features. *Birrell* is instead directed to methods for establishing tunnels in firewalls, which is unrelated to the claim features at issue. Therefore, *Birrell* fails to cure the lack of disclosure in *Win* regarding the features of claim 1.

Accordingly, neither *Win* nor *Birrell* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Claim 12 includes these features at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Therefore, neither *Win* nor *Birrell* teach or suggest all of the features of claim 12. For this reason, the proposed combination of *Win* and *Birrell* when considered as a whole does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 12. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 12 or the other claims in this grouping of claims.

E.2.   No Motivation Exists to Combine *Win* and *Birrell* Because They Address Different Problems

One of ordinary skill would not combine the references to achieve the invention of claim 12 because the references are directed towards solving different problems. It is necessary to consider the reality of the circumstances--in other words, common sense--in deciding in which fields a person of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Wood*, 599 F.2d 1032, 1036, 202 U.S.P.Q. 171, 174 (CCPA 1979). In the case at hand, the cited references address distinct

problems. Thus, no common sense reason exists to establish that one of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor. Accordingly, no teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references and the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claim 12.

For example, *Win* is directed to solving the problem of quickly and consistently providing network access privileges for a user, as established above. On the other hand, *Birrell* is directed to the problem of allowing authorized access to computers protected by firewalls, as shown by the following text:

> Access to intranets is normally controlled by network gateways including firewalls. Firewalls prevent tampering with private resources by unauthorized users. The firewall can also restrict and track the movement of data from inside the firewall to systems outside the firewall. The operation of the firewall is determined by security policies.

> This has created a problem. If a strict security policy is enforced, for example, "never allow an external computer to connect with an internal computer," then there is no satisfactory mechanism to allow a user, who can only connect to the public Internet, to gain access to resources inside the firewall. For example, company employees who are away from the office may need access to private Web servers to read their mail.

Birrell, col. 1, ll. 36-51.

Based on the plain disclosures of the references themselves, the references address completely distinct problems that are unrelated to each other. The problem of quickly and consistently providing network access privileges for a user is completely distinct from the problem of allowing authorized access to computers protected by firewalls.

Because the references address completely distinct problems, one of ordinary skill would have no reason to combine or otherwise modify the references to achieve the invention of claim 12. Thus, no proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 12 or the other claim in this grouping of claims.

F.   CONCLUSION

As shown above, *Marks* does not anticipate claim 1 or any of the other claims. Moreover, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against any of the claims over *Marks*, *Win*, *Corn*, or *Birrell*. Therefore, Applicants request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the rejections. Additionally, Applicants request that the Board direct the Examiner to allow the claims.

/Theodore D. Fay III/
Theodore D. Fay III
Reg. No. 48,504
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
PO Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777

CLAIMS APPENDIX

The text of the claims involved in the appeal is as follows:

1.   A method for managing resources in a computer network, comprising:

creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network, wherein each configuration file contains a list of the network resources that a user may access;

receiving a user identification at a client;

initiating a resource attachment program in response to receiving the user identification;

matching, using the resource attachment program, the user identification with a configuration file associated with the user identification; and

attaching, using the resource attachment program, network resources to the client based on the list contained in the configuration file associated with the user identification.

2.   The method according to claim 1, wherein the list is defined by a network administrator.

3.   The method according to claim 1, wherein each configuration file is stored on a network server.

5.   The method according to claim 1, wherein said resource attachment program is stored on the client computer.

6.   The method according to claim 1, wherein said resource attachment program is stored on a network server.

7.   The method according to claim 1 further comprising: creating a record of all successfully attached resources.

8.   The method according to claim 7, wherein the record is stored on the client.

9.   The method according to claim 7, wherein the record is stored on a network server.

10.   The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

      receiving a log out command; and

      thereafter unattaching the attached resources.

11.   The method according to claim 7, further comprising:

      receiving a log out command; and

      deleting the record of attached resources.

12.   The method according to claim 1, wherein the client uses the UNIX operating system.

15.   The computer program product according to claim 18, wherein the list is defined by a network administrator.

18.   A computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in a data processing system for managing resources in a computer network, the computer program product comprising:

      instructions for creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network, wherein each configuration file contains a list of the network resources that a user may access;

instructions for receiving a user identification at a client;

instructions for initiating a resource attachment program in response to receiving the user identification;

instructions for matching, using the resource attachment program, the user identification with a configuration file associated with the user identification; and

and instructions for attaching, using the resource attachment program, network resources to the client based on the list contained in the configuration file associated with the user identification.

19.   The computer program product according to claim 18, wherein the resource attachment program is stored on the client.

20.   The computer program product according to claim 18, wherein the resource attachment program is stored on a network server.

21.   The computer program product according to claim 18, further comprising instructions for creating a record of all successfully attached resources.

22.   The computer program product according to claim 21, wherein the record is stored on a client computer.

23.   The computer program product according to claim 21, wherein the record is stored on a network server.

24.   The computer program product according to claim 18, further comprising:

       instructions for receiving a log out command; and

       instructions for unattaching the attached resources.

25.   The computer program product according to claim 21, further comprising:

       instructions for receiving a log out command; and

       instructions for deleting the record of attached resources.

26.   The computer program product according to claim 18, wherein the resource attachment program runs on a UNIX operating system.

27.   A system for managing resources in a computer network, comprising:

       means for creating a particular configuration file for each user of a network, wherein each configuration file contains a list of the network resources that a user may access;

       means for receiving a user identification at a client;

       means for initiating a resource attachment program in response to receiving the user identification;

       means for matching, using the resource attachment program, the user identification with a configuration file associated with the user identification; and

       means for attaching, using the resource attachment program, network resources to the client based on the list contained in the configuration file associated with the user identification.

28. The system according to claim 27, further comprising:

    means for receiving a log out command; and

    means for unattaching the attached resources.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence to be presented.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.